

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/823,322	04/02/2001	Matthew Marton	9301-136	8604	
20583	7590 05/12/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY	•		DEJONG, ERIC S		
222 EAST 415				D. 000 MA (DOD	
NEW YORK,	NY 10017		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1631		
		DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/823,322	MARTON ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Eric S. DeJong	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS API		•				
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the folio places the application in condition for allowance, (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comproducing time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a etice of Appeal (With appeal fee) in Hiance with 37-CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evidence with 37 (ence, which SFR-41:31; o r			
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing of this poly		e final rejection, whicheve	er ie-later - tr ne-			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION: See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 GFR 1.136(a). The date on been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment: See 37 GFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filled on 28 April 2006. A brief date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the eafter the mailing date of the final rejection in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 r	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, manuate be filed within to	on fee under 37 ras set forth in (b) ay reduce any vo months of the			
appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any rep						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further compared to the first that the same of the first that the same of the	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.				
NOTE: see continuation sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1-10,12-21 and 64-74. Claim(s) objected to:		rill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11 and 22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ut hafara ar an the data of filing a h	ulation of Annual will r				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(nils to provide a (1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.			
 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by see continuation sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

John S. BRUSCA, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

13. Other: _____.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 09/823, 322

Continuation of Item 3.d. NOTE:

The proposed amendments to claims 11 and 22 would introduce the substantive change of limiting evaluation of drug specificity to a cell. Further, the proposed amendment to claim 22 would introduce the substantive change of limiting the claimed method for evaluating drug specificity to methods steps drawn to "determining" the activity of a drug. Additionally, newly added claims 75 and 76 each recite new limitations that have not been previously presented. If entered, amended claims 11 and 22 and newly presented claims 75 and 76 would require further consideration and search.

Continuation of Item 11. NOTE:

The rejections in the previous Office action mailed 12/28/2005 are maintained for reasons of record. Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) and 102(e)(2) as being anticipated by Goldenberg.

Applicants arguments are directed to amendments to the instant claims which have not been entered onto the record. If the after final amendment submitted by applicants was entered, the amendments to the instant claims would be sufficient to overcome the prior art rejection over Goldenberg, as Goldenberg does not fairly teach or suggest the disclosed application of evaluating drug specificity in a cell.